

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-71 and 73-81 are pending, of which claims 1-6, 11-12, 14-16, 18-19, 23, 27, 30, 51-55, 62-63, 65, 67-71, and 73-78 have been amended.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-23, 28-36, 41-50, 54-59, 60-61, and 65-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by a PCT, International Publication Number WO 02/17205 A2 to DO, Arthur et al. (hereinafter, "Arthur") (*Office Action* p.2). Claim 72 is canceled and Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising:

a destination device configured to request data;

a tracking device configured to:

receive the request for the data from the destination device and redirect the request;

receive tracking information from the destination device when the data is provided to the destination device;

maintain the tracking information in a database;

associate the tracking information with the destination device; and

a server device configured to provide the data that includes the tracking information to the destination device, the server device further configured to receive the redirected request for the data from the tracking device.

1 Arthur does not show or disclose a tracking device that receives a request  
2 for data from a destination device and redirects the request to a server device that  
3 receives the redirected request and then provides the data that includes the tracking  
4 information to the destination device, as recited in claim 1.

5 Arthur describes that content provider 103 (*see* Fig. 1) distributes content to  
6 a publisher 107 where a tracking filter 111 tags the content for tracking purposes  
7 (*Arthur* p.6, lines 1-2; page 7, lines 3-5). A Web server 113 (at publisher 107)  
8 serves the content with the tracking information to requesting users, such as Web  
9 browser 115 (*Arthur* p.7, lines 24-30; page 8, lines 2-4). When the Web browser  
10 115 receives the content, a tracking information request is transmitted to the traffic  
11 register 117 which tracks the usage of the content (*Arthur* p.8, lines 7-9).

12 Arthur does not describe or show in Fig. 1 that the tracking filter 117  
13 receives a content request from the Web browser 115, and redirects the request to  
14 publisher 107. As such, Arthur does not show or disclose a tracking device that  
15 receives a request for data from a destination device, and redirects the request to a  
16 server device, as recited in claim 1.

17 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Arthur and Applicant respectfully  
18 requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

19  
20 Claims 2-13 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1.  
21 Additionally, some or all of claims 2-13 are allowable over Arthur for independent  
22 reasons. For example:

23 Claim 2 recites that the server device includes the tracking device. Arthur  
24 does not show or disclose a server device that includes a tracking device as recited in  
25

1 claim 2. For example, the content provider 103 in Arthur does not include traffic  
2 register 117 (*see* Fig. 1). Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Arthur and the  
3 §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

4  
5 Claim 14 recites a system comprising “a tracking device configured to  
6 receive a request for data from a requesting device and redirect the request for the  
7 data to a data provider, the request including tracking information relating to the  
8 request for the data”, and “a server device configured to receive the redirected  
9 request for the data from the tracking device, and provide the data to the  
10 requesting device.”

11 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does  
12 not show or disclose a tracking device that receives a request for data from a  
13 requesting device and redirects the request, or a server device that receives the  
14 redirected request for the data from the tracking device and provides the data to  
15 the requesting device, as recited in claim 14.

16 Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over Arthur and Applicant respectfully  
17 requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

18  
19 Claims 15-23 and 28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
20 claim 14. Additionally, some or all of claims 15-23 and 28 are allowable over  
21 Arthur for independent reasons. For example:

22 Claim 16 recites that the server device includes the tracking device. As  
23 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 2, Arthur does not show or  
24 disclose a server device that includes a tracking device as recited in claim 16. The  
25

1 content provider 103 in Arthur does not include traffic register 117 (*see* Fig. 1).  
2 Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Arthur and the §102 rejection should be  
3 withdrawn.

4  
5 Claim 29 recites a system comprising “a tracking component configured to  
6 receive a request for content from a requesting device”, and “a content provider  
7 configured to receive the request for content from the tracking component”.

8 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does  
9 not show or disclose a tracking component that receives a request for content from  
10 a requesting device, and a content provider that receives the request for the content  
11 from the tracking component, as recited in claim 29.

12 Claim 29 also recites “the request for content including request-tracking  
13 information relating to the request for content”, and that the content provided to  
14 the requesting device is “content including content-tracking information relating to  
15 providing the content”.

16 Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking content information  
17 relating to the request for content, and content-tracking information relating to  
18 providing the content, as recited in claim 29. The Office cites Arthur for teaching  
19 a tracking component that receives a request for content from a requesting device,  
20 the request for content including request-tracking information relating to the  
21 request for content (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant disagrees because the cited  
22 section of Arthur only describes receiving content that includes tracking  
23 information, and a tracking information request that is not a request for the content  
24  
25

1 (Arthur p.3, lines 28-32). Arthur does not describe tracking content information  
2 relating to the request for content, as recited in claim 29.

3 Claim 29 also recites that the tracking component associates “the  
4 request-tracking information and the content-tracking information with the  
5 requesting device.” Again, Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking  
6 content information and content-tracking information, as recited in claim 29.

7 Accordingly, claim 29 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons  
8 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

9  
10 Claims 30-36 and 41 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
11 claim 29. Additionally, some or all of claims 30-36 and 41 are allowable over  
12 Arthur for independent reasons. For example:

13 Claim 30 recites that the content provider includes the tracking component.  
14 As similarly described above in the response to the rejection of claims 2 and 16,  
15 Arthur does not show or disclose a content provider that includes a tracking  
16 component as recited in claim 30. The content provider 103 in Arthur does not  
17 include traffic register 117 (*see* Fig. 1). Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable over  
18 Arthur and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

19  
20 Claim 42 recites a computing device comprising an application component  
21 configured to receive a request for content, and communicate the request for content  
22 to a content provider. Claim 42 also recites the request including request-tracking  
23 information and the content including content-tracking information.

1 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 29, Arthur does  
2 not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information and content-tracking  
3 information, as recited in claim 42.

4 Claim 42 also recites a database configured to associate the  
5 request-tracking information and the content-tracking information with the  
6 destination device. Arthur also does not describe any such association of  
7 request-tracking information and content-tracking information, as recited in  
8 claim 42.

9 Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons  
10 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

11  
12 Claims 43-50 and 54 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
13 claim 42.

14  
15 Claim 55 recites a method comprising “receiving a request for content from  
16 a destination device, the request including request-tracking information relating to  
17 the request for content”, and “redirecting the request for content to a content  
18 provider that provides the content to a destination device, the content including  
19 content-tracking information relating to providing the content.”

20 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does  
21 not show or disclose receiving a request for content from a destination device and  
22 redirecting the request for content to a content provider, as recited in claim 55.  
23 Additionally, as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 29,  
24 Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information relating to a  
25

1 request for content and content-tracking information relating to providing the  
2 content, as recited in claim 55.

3 Accordingly, claim 55 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons  
4 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

5  
6 Claims 56-61 and 65-66 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
7 claim 55.

8  
9 Claim 67 recites “receiving a request for data from a requesting device, the  
10 request including request-tracking information”, “redirecting the request for the  
11 data to a data provider”, and “providing the data to the requesting device, the data  
12 including content-tracking information.”

13 As similarly described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1,  
14 Arthur does not show or disclose receiving a request for data from a requesting  
15 device and redirecting the request for the data to a data provider, as recited in  
16 claim 67. Additionally, as described above in the response to the rejection of  
17 claim 29, Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information and  
18 content-tracking information, as recited in claim 67.

19 Accordingly, claim 67 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons  
20 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

21  
22 Claims 68-71 and 73-75 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
23 claim 67.

1                   **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

2                   Claims 24-27, 37-40, 51-53, 62-64, and 76-78 are rejected under  
3                   35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over the PCT in view of U.S. Patent  
4                   Publication No. 2002/0116494 to Kocol (hereinafter, "Kocol") (*Office Action*  
5                   p.12). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

6  
7                   Kocol is cited by the Office for teaching tracking information that identifies a  
8                   selectable data link and the rendered content that includes the selectable data link  
9                   (*Office Action* p.13). However, Kocol is not cited for the deficiencies of Arthur as  
10                  described above in response to the §102 rejections. Accordingly:

11                  Claims 24-27 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of  
12                  their dependency upon claim 14 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the  
13                  reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 14.

14                  Claims 37-40 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of  
15                  their dependency upon claim 29 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the  
16                  reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 29.

17                  Claims 51-53 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of  
18                  their dependency upon claim 42 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the  
19                  reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 42.

20                  Claims 62-64 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of  
21                  their dependency upon claim 55 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the  
22                  reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 55.



Claims 76-78 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of their dependency upon claim 67 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 67.

## New Claims

New claims 79-81 are presented for examination. Based on the above discussion regarding Arthur and Kocol, Applicant believes that claims 79-81 are also allowable. Additionally, claim 79 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 14, claim 80 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 29, and claim 81 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon allowable claim 42.

## Conclusion

Pending claims 1-71 and 73-81 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Jan 14, 2005

By:

David A. Morasch  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210